

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Research Background

Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) is one of the topics in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). Feedback in language teaching learning process needs the form of positive reinforcement or correction. Because teachers' responses and evaluation in corrective feedback are typically the principle of the evaluation process means by which L2 learners measure their progress and improvement as writers, there is an obvious need to understand and comprehend their views of instructor feedback, their efforts to respond to their instructors' comments will make them in progress, and the influences of these efforts have on actual performance and real practice (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996). Bitchener & Knoch (2009) also find that the students who are provided with written corrective feedback perform better in writing than those who do not receive any written corrective feedback.

There are many types of WCF approached by many scholars. The scholars have classified the types of written corrective feedback in different ways. One comes from Ellis (2009) who classifies the types of WCF into 6 types; those are direct feedback, indirect feedback, metalinguistic feedback, focused/unfocused feedback, electronic feedback and reformulation. However, for the purpose of this study, the types of feedback are limited to only 2 types that are direct feedback and indirect feedback whose effectiveness are still debated by many scholars to be applied in writing instruction.

The first type of written corrective feedback is called as direct WCF, in which indicate the error and provide the correct form directly (Hosseiny, 2014). The ways to conduct this technique are crossing out of an unnecessary word/phrase/morpheme, the insertion of a missing

word/phrase/morpheme, and provide the correct form directly near the error form (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010). Second is indirect WCF, teacher indicating the error without provide the correct students text (Ellis, 2009; Eslami, 2014; Li & He, 2017). This kind of technique can be executed by underlining or circling the errors in the margin of line (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010). These two types of feedback are contrast because sometimes, what students prefer does not match to what teachers practice in giving feedback. It has been proved by many studies showing different findings.

A number of studies had been conducted to identify the students' preferences and teachers' practices in analyzing what kind of feedback which can be applied effectively by teachers to improve students' language skills, especially in writing skills (for instance, studies conducted by Aridah, Atmowardoyo, & Salija(2017),Bitchener & Knoch (2010), Cohen & Cavalcanti(2017), Ellis (2009), Eslami (2014), Farrokhi (2011), Ferris(2013), and Leki(1991). However, the results of the studies showed that between students' preferences and teachers' practices were incompatible in the use of either direct feedback or indirect feedback which can be applied effectively. Therefore, there is a mismatch between what types of feedback teachers give and what types of feedback students like to have on their papers (Chandler, 2003; Cohen & Cavalcanti, 2017)

The mismatch between students' preferences and teachers' practices have advantages and disadvantages for both students and teachers in teaching learning process. Leki (1991) find that students prefer to have indirect feedback to direct feedback and they want the teacher to give correction to all of their erroneous, including giving comments on ideas and content as well as on their grammar and surface structure. It is supported by (Lalande, 1982)who stated that indirect feedback was able to decrease the errors the students made while direct feedback was not. This type of feedback also brings advantage to the teachers because they can correct students' task so they will not waste their time only for correcting.

In contrast, another researcher like Aridah et al.(2017) find that the students do not prefer indirect feedback as this types of feedback is unclear correction and the teacher only usessymbol in the error correction text.Chandler (2003) supports this finding that direct feedback was preferred by students as they find that this is the fastest and easiest ways to help them correct their writing drafts. However, this type of feedback can create teachers' frustration because they need much time to correct every single word of students' writing.

Based on the review of some previous studies above, it is clear that there is still a mismatch between students' preferences and teachers' practices. In this case, the teachers might fail to fulfill the students' expectation for feedback which may result in students' unsatisfactory writing performance. Therefore, it is necessary to explore students' and teachers' preferences for feedback in order to help teachers to decide what particular feedback will be beneficial or influence positively the students' performance in writing. Therefore, the writer decides to choose this topic to be explored.

## **1.2 Research Problem**

1. How is the teachers' perception about the use of WCF in facilitating language learning?
2. What is the students preferable or expected WCF?

## **1.3 Research Objectives**

According to research problem above, the objectives of research is as follow:

1. To investigate the teachers' perception about the use of WCF in facilitating language learning.
2. To investigate the student's preference and expectation about WCF.

#### **1.4 Scope and Limitations**

The researcher focuses on two types, namely direct CF and indirect CF. This research attempts to explore perception students and teacher about WCF. Considering inconsistency findings of previous studies, it is clear that research about this issue is still needed. Like any other studies, this study also has limitations. First this research only focuses on the preferences of two types of written corrective feedback (i.e. direct and indirect CF). Second, this study only examine learner's in the university contexts.

#### **1.5 Research significance**

##### **1. English teachers**

This study contributes to give teachers understanding about many kinds of feedback which can be applied in teaching learning activities in order to improve students' writing skills. This study also is expected to help teachers in selecting what the best feedback used to match to their students' preferences. In addition, the result of this study can be a reference for the teachers in comparing what feedback should be used either direct WCF or indirect WCF in teaching learning process. Therefore, the teaching learning activities can run well.

##### **2. English Students**

This study is expected to give better understanding to students about types of feedback used by their teachers. Therefore, the students can receive easily what feedback is applied by their teachers without any blaming because every teacher

has their own decision in giving their feedback, especially direct feedback and indirect feedback. Therefore, it can decrease even loss a mismatch between students and teachers relating to feedback.

### 3. Research in the field

This present study can be a reference for the further researchers in doing research relating to direct WCF and indirect WCF. This study is expected to help another researcher in finding other gaps which can be research problems in the future. Reflecting on some researches whose results are still debated in some previous studies, this present study is expected to give clear result in order to help Indonesian learners in improving their writing skills. In addition, this study also can introduce and disseminate WCF research in Indonesian context.

## 1.6 Definition of Key Terms

1. WCF is written error correction used for the teacher to correct the students mistakes in writing task.
2. Direct CF : In direct CF, teachers indicate the error and provide the correct form directly. (Ellis, 2009; Hosseiny, 2014)

Indirect CF : Indirect CF teacher indicating the error without provide the correct one. (Ellis, 2009; Li & He, 2017)